UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,751	05/09/2006	Manuela Javet	3655	8731
Striker Striker &	7590 09/10/200 S Stenby	EXAMINER		
103 East Neck Road			ELHILO, EISA B	
Huntington, NY 11743			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/578,751	JAVET ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Eisa B. Elhilo	1796				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOTS as on time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 Ju</u>	une 2008					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٥,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
· · ·	Claim(s) <u>17-34</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	n					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
-	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are rejected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement					
		r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 6/13/2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/578,751 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

1 This action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 13, 2008.

The cancellation of claims 1-16 is acknowledged. Pending claims are 17-34.

Claims 17-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. (US' 982 A1) for the same reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on March 17, 2008.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

4 Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pratt et al. (US' 982 A1), Applicant argues that Pratt et al. unrelated to the purpose of the present invention and solves an entirely different problem. The applicant also argues that the exemplary dye compositions are all clear solutions and they are not creamy and they do not exhibit a nacreous luster and wherein the composition is free of fatty alkoxylates as a generic negative limitation in the composition.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because the use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain. "In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)). In this case Pratt et al. teaches a dyeing composition that comprises all the claimed dyeing ingredients and wherein the composition may be in a creamy form (see page 29, paragraph 0135).

Art Unit: 1796

With respect to the applicant's argument based on the negative limitations, the examiner would like mention that Pratt et al. does not teach or suggest a dyeing composition comprising fatty alcohol alkoxylates. Therefore, a person of the ordinary skill in the art would expect such a composition to be free of alkoxylated fatty alcohols.

With respect to applicant's argument that the reference teach and disclose claimed ingredients as the optional additives that are not individually required in the composition, the examiner would like to point out that a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10.

With respect to the applicant's argument that Pratt et al. does not teach or suggests the claimed ratio of fatty alcohols to alkaoamide as a result-effective variable that can be optimized to improve the nacreous luster effect, the examiner would like to point out that Pratt et al. teaches fatty alcohols and alkanolamines (alkanolamides) in the percentage amounts that overlapped with the claimed ranges (see page 24, paragraph 0067 and page 29, paragraph, 0130). Therefore, there is a sufficient motivation to one having ordinary skill in the art to formulate such a dyeing composition with the claimed ratio and would expect such a composition to have similar properties to those claimed in the absent of contrary.

Further, as the optimization of results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variable when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the prima facie case of obviousness, see *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA)

1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F. 2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPO 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Furthermore, applicants have not shown on record the criticality of the claimed ratio in claimed composition over the composition of the closest prior art of record.

Conclusion

- 5 The references listed on from PTO-1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.
- THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time 1. policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eisa B. Elhilo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (8:00 -4:30).

Application/Control Number: 10/578,751 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pyon Harold can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eisa B Elhilo/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796 September 4, 2008